

# **Proposal Reviews**

## **#231: Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit**

US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Final Selection Panel Review**

**Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review**

**Sacramento Regional Review**

**External Scientific Review** #1  
#2  
#3

**Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding** #1  
#2

**Environmental Compliance**

**Budget**

## Final Selection Panel Review:

### CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

**Proposal Number:** 231

**Applicant Organization:** US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Proposal Title:** Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Fund	
As Is	X
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount:    **\$289,784**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

**None**

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

**A comment letter from Sacramento River Partners, a co-applicant in the proposal, questioned the accuracy of this project's restoration panel review. In response, the Selection Panel reassessed the proposal.**

**The Selection Panel recommends funding this project as proposed. It is a planning project to design (1) riparian restoration, (2) protection of a pumping site and (3) an interdisciplinary monitoring program. The project can contribute significantly, we now conclude, to restoration of riparian habitats in this area. Its importance is confirmed by its regional review, which found it pursued three of the PSP's regional priorities. The proposal provides an especially strategic opportunity to address both habitat restoration goals and the local irrigation district's need to reduce erosion threatening its facilities. The potential ecological benefits from addressing these issues simultaneously at this site are substantial.**

**The Selection Panel's reassessment of the project found that proposal's technical review misinterpreted the project's emphasis. It does not have an implementation activity, so the outcome will be plans and reviews of plans using all interested parties for restoration planning, and a panel of experts for the monitoring program. The proposal sets out step by step the approaches to be taken for each of the three phases. Most of the funds, about \$160,000 of the requested \$290,000, will go into restoration planning (not pump protection planning as implied**

by reviewers) for 500 acres (not the 77 acres mentioned in reviews), while only \$50,000 will go into pump plant protection planning and \$75,000 into monitoring planning. Because the project includes interested parties along with appropriate agencies, the outcome should have support of most groups. The use of an expert panel to help design the monitoring program might be expanded to having the panel help design or at least review the restoration and pump protection plans. Because the site is already publicly owned, a well received plan is likely to be highly implementable.

# Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review:

## CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Research and Restoration Technical Panel Review Form

**Proposal Number:** 231

**Applicant Organization:** US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Proposal Title:** Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit

**Review:**

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Superior:** outstanding in all respects;

**Above Average:** Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Adequate:** No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

**Not Recommended:** Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Superior	<b>Reviewers ranked the proposal as good or lower and the regional review ranked it as medium. The proposal is a modest proposal for a planning process to restore 77 acres and deal with a pumping station. Objectives are clear but fairly limited in scope. There are no relevant hypotheses. The focus of much of the proposal is dealing with the pumping station and bank hardening and less about the ecosystem restoration. Most of the discussion of tasks is either directly or indirectly linked to the pumping station. Much of the hydraulic analysis is limited to the flows in the immediate vicinity of the station. The analyses may overlook the hydraulics of the larger reach. The planning process is commendable, but support by CALFED seems questionable. A stronger case may be made in the future for the 77-acre restoration effort and how it ties into the overall pattern of resources in the river network.</b>
-Above average	
-Adequate	
XNot recommended	

1. **Goals and Justification.** Does the proposal present a clear statement of goals, objectives and hypotheses? Does the proposal present a clear justification and conceptual model for the project?

**The proposal has a general goal of planning riparian vegetation restoration while protecting a pumping/screening station. The available information provides a useful starting point for such planning. The objectives are clear but fairly limited in scope. There are no relevant hypotheses. The goal of protecting the pumping station and riprap implies that there is a concern and potential disagreement in the local area, but the proposal does not describe the points of contention. The goals and justification for the project would be better assessed by reviewers if they had a good understanding of the situation. The proposal justifies the**

**proposed planning, particularly in relation to the existing sanctuary. The conceptual framework is broadly described and will be developed in the planning process.**

2. **Likelihood of Success (Approach, Feasibility, Capabilities and Performance Measures).** Is the project likely to succeed based on the approach, feasibility and project team capabilities? Are the proposed performance measures adequate for measuring the project's success?

**There are no major impediments to planning and the existing databases provide an excellent context for planning. The geomorphic analysis focuses on local channel responses but does not consider larger reach or network scale patterns and processes. The planning approach is reasonable. Several reviewers noted that the proposal did not explicitly identify alternatives for actions. The background information is adequate to propose a series of actions (or alternatives) as part of the proposal and explore these in the public involvement process. Perhaps the applicants are trying to maintain an open position as part of the public process, but that wasn't made clear in the proposal if it is true. The measures of performance are mostly procedural.**

3. **Outcomes and Products.** Will the project advance the state of scientific knowledge in general and/or make an important contribution to the state of knowledge of the Bay-Delta Watershed? For restoration proposals, is the project likely to contribute to ecosystem restoration or species recoveries in a significant way? Will the project produce products useful to decision-makers and scientists?

**The project is generally consistent with the understanding of the Bay Delta Watershed, but it will not add information that is unique or addresses processes that are poorly understood. Restoration of the 77 acres will add to the existing protection provided by the riparian sanctuary. The outcome of this proposal will provide a slight amount of additional information for refuge managers. The efforts to revegetate the floodplain may be limited without hydrologic and geomorphic modification. Most of the proposal is aimed at protecting the pumping station and less at ecological restoration.**

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**The \$290,000 budget is reasonable for the planning phase of the proposed restoration project.**

5. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

**Regional panel ranked the proposal as Medium priority. It is not clear why the proposal was not rated high. The comments was that it "had the potential to address a hard point fish screen facility in relation to erosion."**

6. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

**Environmental compliance checklist has not been completed. Planning will not require permits.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**None**

## **Sacramento Regional Review:**

**Proposal Number:** 231

**Applicant Organization:** US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Proposal Title:** Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit

Overall Ranking:    -Low    **XMedium**    -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

**The proposed project has potential to address a "hard point" fish screen facility in relationship to erosion of USFWS Lands associated with channel movement and restoration. It is a proactive approach.**

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**USFWS and Sacramento River Partners propose to work with Princeton, Cordora, Glenn and Provident Irrigation Districts to ensure that their new pumping plant facilities are protected while providing riparian restoration on site.**

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**Proposal addresses Sacramento Region PSP Priorities No. 1, 3 & 5.**

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The project is coordinating with SRCA and PPC&G Irrigation District.**

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

**X**Yes -No

How?

**The applicants have presented the project to the SRCA.**

Other Comments:

**The project has the potential to investigate solutions to river meander associated to infrastructure facilities. Would recommend close involvement with the proponants with the PPC&G irrigation District to resolve the erosion issue with a permanent solution.**



## External Scientific: #1

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **231**

Applicant Organization: **US Fish and Wildlife Service**

Proposal Title: **Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit**

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

**X**Correct

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

**None.**

#### Review:

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Excellent: outstanding in all respects;**

**Good: quality but some deficiencies;**

**Poor: serious deficiencies.**

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	<b>My overall assessment of this project is "good," although I have some concerns about the vague statement of goals for the restoration and interdisciplinary monitoring plans. If implemented well, this project holds great promise for achieving both ecological and economic/flood management goals or at least for opening agency-public discussion on these issues. Developing an inclusive process for public discussion of restoration options is of high value in and of itself and could provide a model for future restoration planning. Developing a long-term research plan would also be of value for rigorously addressing scientific and practical issues in ecological restoration. My biggest criticism of the proposal, however, is the lack of a clear statement of the goals for ecological restoration and the interdisciplinary monitoring plan. While clearer goals should be developed during the planning process itself, it seems that there should be something to bring to the table right now. For the monitoring/research plan in particular, it would be appropriate to clearly stipulate what some of the key questions are that need to be answered. Research or monitoring with vaguely-defined goals is unproductive</b>
XGood	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

On one level, the overall goals are clearly and consistently stated: to develop a riparian restoration plan, a plan for protecting a pumping plant and expensive fish screen, and production of an interdisciplinary monitoring plan. A key feature of meeting these goals will be to conduct an inclusive planning process that communicates with and incorporates input from all stakeholders and affected parties. Several citizens' groups with direct interest in flood control, agriculture, and protection of the pumping plant and flood relief structures, will work collaboratively with USFWS and Sacramento River Partners to come up with the restoration and pump protection plans. Ideally, this will help ensure restoration plans that can meet multiple economic and ecological objectives and that will have strong local support. Besides direct input from stakeholders, hydraulic modeling will be used to assess restoration options that will be compatible with flood management and flood relief structure maintenance goals. Another key feature will be the use of an expert scientific panel to review the plans and develop an interdisciplinary plan for long-term, research-oriented monitoring on the site, which will help to test key assumptions of the conceptual model and inform future restoration projects. The hypotheses are clearly stated, but are really more a part of the conceptual model or project assumptions than true scientific hypotheses. Although the goals were fairly clearly stated, their underlying specifics and purpose were not always clear. In my reading of the proposal, it seemed as if there were some underlying issues motivating the project that were never explicitly stated in the proposal. For instance, it appears that USFWS has some kind of restoration action in mind, but the proposal is very murky (perhaps intentionally so?) on what these are. Of course, the goal of the proposal is to provide an open forum for developing restoration options, so perhaps the lack of clearly stated restoration goals in the proposal should not be surprising. Perhaps the applicants are avoiding specific restoration proposals now that might stifle input from stakeholders or create controversy at the beginning of the project, because of potentially conflicting project goals (i.e., ecological restoration vs. protection of bank revetments). The goal to develop long-term interdisciplinary monitoring also suffered from the same lack of specificity. While comprehensive monitoring may be a worthwhile endeavor, it seems as if it should still have a clearly identified goal or set of questions. In this proposal, long-term interdisciplinary monitoring is held up as a goal in itself, without clearly defining the issues and questions that the monitoring will be designed to address. Of course, one feature of this project will be to develop these questions, based on input from their panel of scientific experts. This, however, does not negate the value of stating a few key questions that monitoring could address. The issues of collaborative agency-stakeholder conservation planning to meet multiple objectives, of assessing cumulative hydraulic effects of riparian restoration, and of designing comprehensive, scientifically-driven monitoring are timely and important.

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

The conceptual model that dealt with limiting factors on natural vegetation recovery was fairly clear and supported the need for active restoration (such as planting native species) on the site. The discussion of hydraulic issues was not clear to this reviewer, who is an outsider to this system. It wasn't clear to me what the relationship was between potential restoration on this site and flood relief structures upstream, nor was it clear from the maps provided in the proposal where the actual flood relief structures were. In addition, it is really difficult to

judge the relevance of potential restoration to basin flood management when no suggestion is given at what restoration measures are being considered. From elsewhere in the proposal, it evidently does not mean enabling channel migration by removal of the rock revetment, since this conflicts directly with other project goals. If this is the case, perhaps the authors should have more directly stated the underlying conflicts in these goals, which I suppose supports the need for collaborative planning with stakeholders. I never really understood the significance of the proposed interdisciplinary monitoring. The applicants emphasized this as a major advance over typical scientific research and performance-based restoration monitoring. However, it is unclear what the goals driving this part of the project are, nor what will actually be done. What are the questions that make this particular site the focal point for a comprehensive monitoring plan? While I realize that these will be developed by the expert panel, it seems that the proposal should give more than just a vague inkling of what the questions will be and why they are of interest. For monitoring to be successful and useful, it should be strongly question- and goal-driven. There is some sign that the questions will be related to the factors limiting the recovery of natural vegetation on the site, but these should be more clearly defined and stated as questions or hypotheses. More attention could have been given to conceptual model related to the planning process, and in particular, to incorporating the goals of different interests into the restoration plan. This is really the key aspect of the proposal. Given the range of different stakeholder interests and the possible conflicting goals of ecological restoration and river management, the selection of a planning project is justified. Given the importance of the area and the issues to be dealt with, full-scale implementation of the planning process is justified.

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

The approach is reasonably well designed and appropriate for meeting the project objectives. The hydraulic analysis of the effects of local site restoration, and the cumulative effects of restoration on other sites within the reach, will be important for assessing the compatibility of restoration with flood management in the basin. This will be an important addition to the knowledge base. Assessing the influence of local restoration on hydrology and in particular on the protection of the pumping plant and rock revetment will be important for coming up with restoration solutions that benefit multiple parties. In general too, the collaborative, inclusive approach to planning is a step in the right direction for resolving large-scale issues on the Sacramento River. If successful, it could provide a model for future planning efforts on the Sacramento or elsewhere, and would provide a foundation of good faith on which to build future agency-landowner cooperation. Use of an expert panel for developing an interdisciplinary monitoring plan and for reviewing of the restoration plans is a nice feature of the project that will add scientific rigor to the restoration and may lead to high quality monitoring/research that can be used to address key issues influencing restoration success. If properly designed, with a clear focus and appropriate research questions, the interdisciplinary monitoring could produce information that will improve future ecological restoration projects. I have two criticisms of the approach. First of all, it seems to me that the ecological restoration and the pumping plant protection measures are interconnected (and possibly conflicting), rather than separate issues. Protection of the pumping plant may place important constraints on the ecological restoration, or vice versa. Perhaps these should be more explicitly considered together during the public scoping meetings, hydraulic assessment, and formation of the conceptual and comprehensive unit plans. Secondly, as I suggested above, the interdisciplinary monitoring plan needs to have more clearly defined goals or questions. Creating a big monitoring project just for the sake of monitoring seems pointless. Effective research or monitoring requires a goal. The proposal gives some hints about key research areas to be addressed, but these could be stated

more clearly as questions. What are the big issues, questions that need to be resolved in riparian restoration? A clear statement of these would give more direction to the proposal and a greater impetus for the proposed interdisciplinary monitoring. Clearer statement of goals or questions would not stifle the creativity of the expert panel, and if anything, would help to focus the panel on key restoration research needs "Research" is really a better word for what is being proposed, but the authors may have used the word "monitoring" because this is a restoration proposal.

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

The approach is technically feasible, but is no guarantee that the planning process will result in comprehensive plans that will meet all objectives and make everyone happy. There may be some issues that are difficult to resolve. However, given the pressing issues and the high restoration potential on the site, such an effort must be made. Perhaps some creative solutions can be developed to achieve both ecological and economic/flood management goals. The approach as outlined contains the appropriate steps for achieving these goals. The scale of the project is appropriate. An inclusive, comprehensive planning process is a necessary precursor to full implementation of a restoration project on this site.

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

Because this is a planning project, performance will be measured by completion of the proposed tasks within the schedule outlined for the project. These are not really quantifiable, nor would I expect them to be. Measures of success include participation of local interests in the planning process and the development of plans that meet objectives for ecological restoration, flood management, and protection of infrastructure. Surprisingly, no performance measures were listed for the interdisciplinary monitoring plan. Suitable performance measures could have included development of a comprehensive research plan with hypotheses of key importance for addressing restoration issues and planning of experiments to address those hypotheses.

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

The major products are the collaborative, inclusive planning process itself and any plans that arise from it. These will include a plan for ecological restoration of the site, a plan for protection of the pumping plant, an assessment of the system wide and local influences of restoration projects on river hydraulics, a compilation of baseline information, a summary report that puts these all together, and development of an interdisciplinary research/monitoring plan designed to address key data needs for riparian restoration. Quarterly, annual, and final reports will be included. All of these products will be valuable for eventually implementing restoration on this site, and development of long-term, restoration-focused research could provide information of great value for other restoration projects on California rivers.

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

The applicants have a strong track record in planning and ecological restoration on the Sacramento River. Both USFWS and the Sacramento River Partners (SRP) have significant restoration experience, and USFWS has conducted baseline monitoring on the ecology of the system. SRP also appears to have a strong record at working with the public. The identified expert panel members provide strong expertise in ecology, hydrology, soils, and geomorphology. However, if part of the goal is to develop a rigorous set of experiments to test key issues in riparian restoration, I would strongly urge that they include a statistician with a strong background in experimental design on the panel. Someone with strong skills at synthesis and integration, perhaps an ecological modeler, would also be a good addition to the panel. The two subcontractors are engineering firms with experience and expertise in hydrologic/hydraulic assessment. Ayres Associates is an engineering consulting firm with offices and projects throughout the U.S. The level of expertise of the project team in public outreach, conducting and facilitating public meetings, and mediating conflict resolution is not clear, although both USFWS and SRP personnel have likely had such experience. Otherwise, the applicants might consider bringing in a consultant to assist with this phase of the project.

8. Cost/Benefit Comments. Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

The project seems quite economical, at just \$290,000 for holding public meetings, site restoration planning, hydraulic assessment, development of the pumping plant protection plan, and development of the scientific monitoring plan. All of these tasks are important for the project, although the interdisciplinary monitoring plan is less essential to making immediate progress towards achieving restoration goals on the site. However, a carefully designed research plan could yield data that would inform restoration activities throughout the Sacramento basin and on other California rivers. Successful development of a comprehensive site management/restoration plan would be very valuable, given the ecological potential of the site and the potentially conflicting management issues. Successful restoration on the site could have high value, with the site fitting into a contiguous block of over 2000 acres of natural habitat within a 10 mile river corridor, and with the potential for conservation of a landscape containing a unique mix of habitat types.

Miscellaneous comments:

None.

## External Scientific: #2

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **231**

Applicant Organization: **US Fish and Wildlife Service**

Proposal Title: **Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit**

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

**X**Correct

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

**none**

#### Review:

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Excellent: outstanding in all respects;**

**Good: quality but some deficiencies;**

**Poor: serious deficiencies.**

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	<b>This proposal would lead to restoring 77 acres and planning around a pumping station. The proposal is more about the pumping station and bank hardening and places relatively little emphasis on the ecosystem restoration. The hydraulic analysis focuses on flows around the station and not the larger reach of the river. The link to the sanctuary is a very positive aspect of the proposal but the area addressed is relatively small. If planning were focused more on the restoration and ecological solutions to the pumping stations were stressed, I would rank the planning proposal higher.</b>
<b>X</b> Good	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

**The proposal has a general goal of planning riparian vegetation restoration while protecting a pumping/screening station. The available information provides a useful starting point for such planning. The objectives are clear but fairly limited in scope. There are no relevant hypotheses.**

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?

**The proposal justifies the proposed planning, particularly in relation to the existing sanctuary. The conceptual framework is broadly described and will be developed in the planning process.**

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

**There are not major impediments to planning and the existing databases provide an excellent context for planning. The planning approach is reasonable.**

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

**The planning approach is reasonable.**

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

**The measures of performance are mostly procedural.**

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

**The project is generally consistent with the understanding of the Bay Delta Watershed, but it will not add information that is unique or addresses processes that are poorly understood. Restoration of the 77 acres will add to the existing protection provided by the riparian sanctuary. The outcome of this proposal will provide a slight amount of additional information for refuge managers. The efforts to revegetate the floodplain may be limited without hydrologic and geomorphic modification. Most of the proposal is aimed at protecting the pumping station and less at ecological restoration.**

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

**no comment**

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**The budget is reasonable for the planning phase of the proposed restoration project.**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

## External Scientific: #3

### Research and Restoration External Scientific Review Form

Proposal Number: **231**

Applicant Organization: **US Fish and Wildlife Service**

Proposal Title: **Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit**

#### Conflict of Interest Statements:

I have no financial interest in this proposal.

**X**Correct

-Incorrect

In the blank below please explain any connection to proposal, to applicant, co-applicant or subcontractor or to submitting institution (write "none" if no connection):

**None**

#### Review:

**Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:**

**Excellent: outstanding in all respects;**

**Good: quality but some deficiencies;**

**Poor: serious deficiencies.**

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
-Excellent	<b>This is a well-argued proposal. Hopefully, in the planning process, natural grade controls and similar restoration techniques will be explored and compared to more traditional techniques. The proposed planning process seems to offer the opportunity to explore the physical and biological origins of pre-settlement landscape.</b>
XGood	
-Poor	

1. **Goals.** Are the goals, objectives and hypotheses clearly stated and internally consistent? Is the concept timely and important?

**The goals and objectives are good. The hypotheses make no sense. This is a planning study. Making predictions and testing those predictions are not relevant activities to this study.**

2. **Justification.** Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge? Is a conceptual model clearly stated in the proposal and does it explain the underlying basis for the proposed work? Is the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project justified?



**The planning area is well defined and described. The planning model is appropriate for the task. The basis of the model is well understood.**

3. **Approach.** Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? Are results likely to add to the base of knowledge? Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodology or approaches? Will the information ultimately be useful to decision-makers?

**The approach to the planning process is good. Organizing an interdisciplinary team is important to the success of the project. This is particularly true in regard to the monitoring plan. Also, the hydrologic/hydraulic study is critical to keeping the plan focused on the important issues of water depths and availability.**

4. **Feasibility.** Is the approach fully documented and technically feasible? What is the likelihood of success? Is the scale of the project consistent with the objectives?

**The proposed planning effort is feasible. It has a high probability of success.**

5. **Project-Specific Performance Measures.** Does the project include appropriate performance measures to measure success relative to the project's goals and objectives? Is there enough detail as to how the performance measures will be quantified? For restoration projects, are monitoring plans explicit and detailed enough to determine if performance measures will be adequately assessed?

**The performance measures are the products: the restoration plan, the hydrologic/hydraulic analysis and monitoring plan. Their completion and quality will determine the performance of the participants.**

6. **Products.** Are products of value likely from the project? Specifically for restoration projects, are products of value also likely from the monitoring component? Are interpretative outcomes likely from the project?

**Discussed in Section 5.**

7. **Capabilities.** What is the track record of applicants in terms of past projects? Is the project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project? Do they have available the infrastructure and other aspects of support necessary to accomplish the project?

**The planning members and organizations are well qualified. They have the necessary means to develop a suitable plan.**

8. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

**The cost are reasonable and the benefits commensurate with the cost. But, why is this organization requesting money to evaluate a project (the pumping station) of the Army Corps of Engineers**

**Miscellaneous comments:**

**The budget analysis is difficult to read and confusing. The CALFED format needs to be changed and the budget table needs to be comma delimited.**

## **Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1**

**New Proposal Number:** 231

**New Proposal Title:** Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**01-N08, FWS, San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge Riparian Habitat Protection and Floodplain Restoration Project - Phase II 01-N11, FWS, Habitat Acquisition for Riparian Brush Rabbit and Riparian Woodrat Ecosystem Restoration**

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**N/A**

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

**Please note, Sacramento River Partners is also listed as applicant. NFWF does not have any direct agreements with Sacramento River Partners.**

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

-Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

**Applicant listed 97-N02 and 97-N03, for which TNC is the primary recipient.**

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

-Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

-Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

**This is not a next phase project.**

Other Comments:

## Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

**New Proposal Number:** 231

**New Proposal Title:** Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

**Pine Creek Orchards Acquisition- OFT (non-contract) Hartley Island- OFT (non-contract) La Barranta Feasibility Report, CVPIA 1162000J331 AFRP**

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

-Yes -No **X**N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

**AFRP provided funds for purchasing both land parcels were provided through an OFT (Office Fund Target) transfer. As such there were no contracts in place other than this clients intent to acquire these major land parcels which were accomplished on time and within budget.**

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

**X**Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

**I have listed all the projects funded by the AFRP through The Nature Conservancy. Clients manage the FWS of the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge and have a strong record of successful land acquisitions**

## **Environmental Compliance:**

**Proposal Number:** 231

**Applicant Organization:** US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Proposal Title:** Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

-Yes **X**No

If no, please explain:

**It is not clear whether this proposal is for planning only, or whether environmental documentation will be funded from this proposal.**

**Text has extensive explanation of permits and other environmental documents that will be needed for full restoration project, but the Environmental Compliance Checklist has not been filled out. Project proponents need to clarify timing of environmental documentation in relation to this proposal, and check off all the permits that will likely be needed.**

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

-Yes **X**No

If no, please explain:

**See comment above. No money or time is budgeted for environmental documentation.**

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

-Yes **X**No

If yes, please explain:

**If proposal is only for planning, then the lack of budget and detail on environmental documentation does not impair the feasibility. If this proposal is for funding actual restoration activities, feasibility will depend on the appropriate permitting and environmental documentation being completed.**

Other Comments:

## **Budget:**

**Proposal Number:** 231

**Applicant Organization:** US Fish and Wildlife Service

**Proposal Title:** Riparian Restoration Planning and Feasibility Study for the Riparian Sanctuary, Llano Seco Unit

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

☐Yes ☒No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

**Figures differ by \$1.00.**

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments: